

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11-14, 16, 18-20 and 22-28. Claims 1, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 26-28 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Claims 10, 15, 17 and 21 remain cancelled. Thus, claims 1-9, 11-14, 16, 18-20 and 22-28 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112¶1:**

At item 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112¶1. Claims 9, 11, 12 and 14 are amended herein. The rejection of claim 13 should now be withdrawn in light of the amendments to claim 9.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):**

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 18, 19 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,088,023 (Louis) and claims 16, 20 and 22-24 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,380,929 (Platt).

The Examiner appears to equate the Louis system directed to integrating functions of touchpads (relative mode) with that of graphic tablets (absolute mode) with the claimed invention. In Louis, a graphics window (28) displaying a geometric relationship to the cursor is displayed in the relative mode only when it is determined that the input surface (16) is stimulated (see, col. 5, line 66 through line 9 and Fig. 2) and the displayed graphics window (28) is anchored at a current location on the display during the absolute mode regardless of whether the input surface (16) is stimulated or not (see, col. 7, lines 29-36). Thus, Louis is directed to generating a cursor image in the graphics window at a position matching the position of the contact element relative to the input surface during both the relative and absolute modes (see also, blocks 38 and 66 in Fig. 2).

The Examiner relies on Platt to reject claims 16, 20 and 22-24. Platt, however, is directed to disabling a mouse mode of an input device in response to a draw command from a user to display drawing strokes and enabling back the mouse mode after a fixed time during which no drawing strokes have been made to display relative cursor positions responsive to the mouse movements (see, Fig. 3 including corresponding text).

Independent claim 1, by way of example recites, “a first mode settable to provide a first function corresponding to the touch operation including a touch position without displaying a predetermined shape marker indicative of a detection of a touch in the touch position”, where the first function triggers “a command corresponding to an option located at the touch position.”

Claim 1 further recites a second mode providing a second function of “displaying the predetermined shape marker indicative of the detection of the touch in the touch position without executing the first function corresponding to the touch operation including the touch position.”

Independent claims 5, 16, 18 and 19 recites similar features.

Independent claims 9 and 20 recite, “executing a normal command corresponding to the operator’s input operation using said pointing device without displaying the predetermined shape marker”, where the normal command executes “an option located at the touch position of said input operation” and “displaying the marker for a predetermined time without executing the normal command.”

Independent claim 26 recites, “a first mode settable to display a predetermined shape marker indicative of a touch corresponding to a touch position of the detected touch operation” and “a second mode settable to execute a command of an option located at the touch position without displaying the marker indicative of the detection of the touch.”

Claim 27 recites, “switchably processing information of a touch operation”, where first and second modes execute “a function triggering a selectable option provided at the touch position without displaying a predetermined shape marker... and displaying the predetermined shape marker indicative of the detection of the touch position of the touch operation without executing the function of the touch operation”, respectively.

Claim 28 as amended recites, “executing a first mode triggering a function of a menu provided at a position of a touch operation upon detection of the touch operation in an operation window displaying a first content” and “a second mode displaying a marker indicating a location of the touch position including coordinates thereof... to enable a second content having the marker to be displayed in the operation window.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Louis and Platt do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the independent claims discussed above.

Specifically, Louis and Platt, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-discussed features including triggering or executing a first function of “an option located at the

touch position... without displaying marker” and switching to “displaying the marker without executing the function”, as recited in the independent claims.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Louis and Platt.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Louis and Platt. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 3, “said first display control unit executes the control so that the information is exclusively displayed on any one of said display device or said operation screen unit” (see also claim 7 that recites similar features).

Louis and Platt do not teach or suggest switchably displaying a marker and activating an option where “said first display control unit executes the control so that the information is exclusively displayed on any one of said display device or said operation screen unit”, as recited in claims 3 and 7.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):**

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the following: Platt, U.S. Patent No. 6,215,479 (Matsui) and Louis.

The arguments presented above with respect to claims 1, 5 and 20, upon which claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 25 depend are incorporated herein.

The Examiner relies on Matsui as teaching the claimed connecting module connecting a display device. However, Matsui is directed to coupling a monitor output terminal (20) for displaying a processed video image displayed on divided display blocks of an image displaying apparatus (see, Fig. 5).

Claim 2 recites, “a connecting module for connecting a display device capable of displaying information in addition to said operation screen unit” and “a second function of displaying a marker for indicating a detection of the touch in at least one of a touch position and a display position on said display device based on the touch operation if the touch operation is detected on said operation screen unit.” Claims 4, 6 and 8 recite similar features.

The cited references do not teach or suggest the above discussed features, including “displaying a marker for indicating a detection of the touch in at least one of a touch position and

a display position on said display device based on the touch operation if the touch operation is detected" instead of the first function (see claims 2, 4, 6 and 8).

Further, for at least the same reasons indicated regarding independent claim 20, dependent claim 25 is patentably distinguishable.

In particular, the references do not teach or suggest first and second operation modes including controlling the display of the information "on which display coordinates corresponding to the coordinates on said display unit are set" and "displaying the marker on at least one of said display unit and said other display device on which the information is being displayed", as recited in claim 25.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/17/2006

By: Temnit Afework  
Temnit Afework  
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501